Washington State Department of Transportation
Public Transportation and Rail Division
Office of Transit Mobility

Advisory Committee Meeting
WSDOT Urban Planning Office

August 19, 2005
9:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m.

Attendees
Charlie Howard (PSRC); Peter Heffernan (King County); Ron Posthuma (King
County DOT); Joy Munkers (Community Transit); Wendy Clark-Getzin (Kitsap
Transit); Bob Hart (RTC); Paul Kaftanski (Everett Transit); Lisa Wolterink (Sound
Transit); Jeannette Johnson (Community Transit); Dean Lookingbill (RTC); Matt
Hansen (King County Metro); Jemae Hoffman (City of Seattle); Rod Thornton
(City of Pullman); Rob Johnson (Transportation Choices); Peter Thein (WSTA);
Lynne Griffith (C-Tran); Martha Rose (Island Transit); Kathleen Collins (Spokane
Transit); Leo Bowman (Ben Franklin Transit); Mary Place (City of Yakima); Brian
Ziegler (Pierce Co.); Kim van Ekstrom (City of Redmond); Lon Wyrick (TRPC)
Janice Hamil, Theresa Smith, Judy Giniger, Cathy Silins (WSDOT)

Goal of Today's Meeting
Reach concurrence on "Draft Call for Projects".

Overview of Previous Work
The Grant Technical Work Group reached consensus on a procedure to evaluate
projects and send a recommendation of rankings to the Advisory Committee for
further review. It was also felt to be very important that WSDOT staff was not
solely responsible for grading the applications. The specific details of the
evaluation process will be dependent upon the total number of applications
received. It was pointed out that we could receive hundreds of applications with
multiple applications from some jurisdictions. The grant workshops may help
reduce the number of applications we receive. The technical group is confident
that they are following the intent of the legislation in drafting the criteria.

Discussion: Grant Criteria
Committee members raised questions regarding the actions the Legislature
would take after the prioritized list was submitted on December 1st. At this point
the details of how the Legislature will proceed are unknown. However it is clear
that the Legislature does not want a list of projects totaling $20 million; they want
a high, medium and low list of all the project proposals we receive. The
committee needs to recommend good solid projects to show the Legislature the
value of this program. Although the committee can't reject project proposals that
don't meet the threshold criteria, they can be moved to the bottom of the list.

Another member asked if park and rides were eligible for this grant and whether they would be broken out and listed separately. Although there is an additional source of funds for park and rides which is a total of $30 million over the life of the Transportation Partnership Act, they are still eligible for this grant program and are specifically mentioned within the legislation. The grant program is looking for quick and easy wins, so park and rides may be a good option.

Discussion: Evaluation Process
Committee members discussed the need to ensure that the projects being proposed are consistent with that jurisdiction's Transportation Plan. Members wanted someway of verifying that projects really are coordinated. However there was some concern that it would take too long for RTPOs and MPOs to get sign-off from their boards. Other members wondered why these agencies, if they have representatives on these committees, aren't already working to get those coordination talks going now and not waiting until the last minute.

It was made clear that both the application questions and the evaluation criteria would be provided to all applicants, so that they know how their projects will be evaluated – this process is not secret.

The Advisory Committees role will continue even after the prioritized grant proposals have been submitted to the Legislature. The AC will help the Office of Transit Mobility develop a business plan and will continue to provide direction in the implementation of the duties of the office.

Discussion: Draft Call for Projects
A committee member questioned why the name of the grant program doesn't specifically refer to transit. The name was established by the Legislature, so it cannot be changed.

Committee members made specific suggestions about changes to the call for projects including:
A statewide reference should be added to the first paragraph such as "to support projects across the state . . .".

Purpose
Add an additional bullet indicating that the criteria follow the application.
Funding
Theresa will determine if these grant funds will be eligible for re-appropriation.
Match Requirement
Suggest replacing "preference" with "strong consideration" and replace "fully funded" with something like "identify secured or unsecured funds".
Eligible Applicants
Theresa owes the committees a legal definition of local governments.

General Requirements
1b add the word "agency" after "project lead" and something stating that "any project that requires services or money from another jurisdiction must include a letter of concurrence".

Project Proposals
Use the phrase "for example" before the bulleted items under each lettered question.
Add "person" to the word "delay" in the first bullet under letter A.
Under letter C, add language indicating they will be required to report for the duration of the grant.
Move letter D to the general requirements – applicants must have a financial plan.
Last two bullets are not "for examples" – they should be required questions for the financial info.

Discussion: Draft Framework for Project Evaluation
A. **Guidance** add language on cost savings.
B. **Impact on Congested Corridors** mention bottlenecks and chokepoints.
C. **System Integration** add language discussing the improvement of regional connections or cross-jurisdictional services.
D. **Measurability** move to general requirements,
E. **Long-Term Benefit/Sustainability** should not have a negative consequence – de-emphasize "long-term" and leave "benefit".
F. **Financial Plan and Sustainability** discuss secured funding, ask how it is secured.

For scoring ease ensure the Call for Projects and Scoring Framework correlate.

Other Issues
- Send the reporting form to the committee for review.
- In the application information describe requirements for margins, font size, and electronic submission. Make it clear that electronic submittals are required, not optional, and paper submittals will not be accepted.
- Add language upfront: "Any project which requires coordination or match funds must include a letter of concurrence." Concurrence letter should be one letter, with signature blocks for all players.
- A glossary to describe terms and acronyms should be included.
- Explain the reporting requirement up front in the application packet.

Issues for Discussion at Joint Meeting
- Do transit agencies have the ability to veto projects – if people are truly coordinating this shouldn't be necessary.
- How long would reporting be required – 1 year? 10 years?
- Capital versus operating projects – how do you report the former quarterly?
- Why do we need to know about sustainability? Do we take away points for no sustainable plan, or just give extra?

- Timeline: is there a deadline in which projects must be completed?
- What are the options for sorting grants once they have been received?
- Are efficiency and congestion relief two separate issues or not.

Wrap - up
The meeting concluded at 12:45 p.m.

The next meeting will be the joint meeting of the Grant Technical Work Group and the Advisory Committee which will occur Friday September 2nd from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. The meeting will be held at a NEW LOCATION the King County Department of Transportation building at 201 S Jackson St in the 8th floor conference room (across the street from where we usually meet).